The author, Ethel Sawyer, retains copyright of this document. You may use quotes from this paper as per "fair use" rules regarding such materials.
Two places where you can learn about "fair use" rules are:
http://copyright.gov/fair-use/more-info.html
and:
https://copyright.columbia.edu/basics.html

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Sociology-Anthropology Honors

Essay Series

A STUDY OF A PUBLIC LESBIAN COMMUNITY

by

Ethel Sawyer

An essay presented to the
Department of Sociology-Anthropology of
Washington University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree
of Master of Arts

September, 1965

Saint Louis, Missouri

In spite of the tremendous strides which sociologists have made in the study of deviant behavior, they have generally tended to ignore the deviant phenomenon of homosexuality, and have left the subject to psychoanalysts, psychologists and novelists to explore.[1] Whatever the reasons -- whether due to the perceived difficulty of entree, of establishing and maintaining rapport with homosexual subjects, or perhaps to the fear of the label itself, (Hooker,[2] Stern[3]) homosexuality has not been one of the concerns of sociologists, and there remains as a result a considerable gap in our knowledge of the subject. With the exception of studies conducted by Hooker[4] and Leznoff and Westley[5] on homosexual communities (both dealing with male homosexuals), previous research in the area of homosexuality in general and female homosexuality in particular has yielded little information relative to this pattern of behavior in the actual community.

---

[1]This paper is based on research currently underway which is supported by the National Institute of Mental Health, Grant No: MH-09189. The author is especially indebted to Lee Rainwater whose continued encouragement and assistance has helped to make this study possible. Appreciation also goes to Robert Hamblin for his consultation on the construction of the numerical estimation questionnaire and to Pat Rutherford for her assistance in typing this paper.

[2]Hooker, Evelyn, "Male Homosexuality," in Norman L. Farberow, (ed.) Taboo Topics. New York: Atherton Press, Prentice-Hall, 1963.

[3]Stern, Jess, The Grapevine. New York: Doubleday, 1965. Stern reports the response, "I wouldn't dare embark on such a study, what would people think?" by a female sociologist studying male homosexuals, when questioned as to her reasons for not doing a comparable study on female homosexuals.

[4]Hooker, Evelyn, "The Homosexual Community," reprinted from Proceedings of the XIV International Congress of Applied Psychology, Copenhagen, Munkegard, 1961.

[5]Leznoff, M., and Westley, W., "The Homosexual Community," in Ruitenbeek, (ed.), The Problem of Homosexuality in Modern Society. New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., Inc., 1963.

On the basis of data presented by various researchers on the incidence of homosexuality (Kinsey,[6] Stern,[7-8] Cory[9]) it can be reasonably asserted that the major portion of persons who are homosexual are not those persons who have been treated by psychoanalysts nor those who are institutionalized, but are persons who are found in the community at large and functioning as otherwise "normal" individuals. That many of these persons are members of homosexual groups or societies is a theme which runs through much of the literature on the subject of homosexuality (Life Magazine,[10] Rechy,[11] Stern,[12] Cory and Leroy[13]). The importance of the homosexual society in understanding its members and the needs for research along these lines are reflected in the statement:

---

[6]Kinsey, Alfred C., Pomeroy, Wardell B. and Martin, Clyde E., Sexual Behavior in the Human Male. Philadelphia: Sanders, 1948. Kinsey contends that somewhere around 37 per cent of the male population have engaged in some homosexual practices, 8 per cent have been exclusively homosexual for at least three years, and 4 per cent through their lives.

[7]Stern, Jess, The Sixth Man. New York: Doubleday, 1961. Stern suggests that possibly one out of every six men in America may be homosexual.

[8]Stern, Jess, The Grapevine, Op. Cit. Though Stern does not give figures, he suggests that female homosexuality may be more widespread than male homosexuality.

[9]Cory, D., The Homosexual in America. New York: Castle Books, 1960. Cory estimates that somewhere between 1 and 10 per cent of American males are exclusively homosexual.

[10]Welch, Paul, "Homosexuality in America," Life Magazine, June 26, 1964.

[11]Rechy, John, City of Night. New York: Grove Press, 1964.

[12]Stern, Jess, The Grapevine, Op. Cit.

[13]Cory, D. and Leroy, John, The Homosexual and His Society. New York: Citadel Press, 1963.

> "The direct primary gratifications of many kinds which are afforded the individual who participates in the homosexual culture constitute one of the most important determinants of his homosexual behavior; help to determine the particular role he will play, make it exceedingly difficult, if indeed not impossible for him to change his psychosexual pattern, help to define his self-concept as a homosexual and continue to give it support. He remains homosexual not just because he is fearful of heterosexuality, but because the total homosexual way of life, and not just primarily sexual gratifications, are to him compelling ones; and these rewards and gratifications are found in homosexual groups."[14]

It is the female homosexual society with its norms and values with which this paper deals, and therefore female homosexuality in its various social as well as sexual aspects.

Subjects and Methods of Research

The subjects of research are Negro public female homosexuals, somewhat similar to those homosexuals which Leznoff and Westley define as "overt" homosexuals. They point out that "overt homosexuals gather in cohesive social groups which become the dominant focus of their lives. These groups are openly homosexual in character. Their members make little effort to conceal their deviation, spend almost all of their free time with the group and tend to regard their other activities as peripheral."[15] These homosexuals in the beginning stages of research frequented a particular bar and grill (which I shall refer to as Jim's), though the focus of interaction has from time to time shifted to other settings.

The greater portion of these homosexuals may be defined as persons

---

[14]Hooker, Evelyn, "A Preliminary Analysis of Group Behavior in Homosexuals," The Journal of Psychology, 42:217-225, 1956.

[15]Leznoff and Westley, Op. Cit., p. 170.

of lower socio-economic status, though by taking occupation and income alone, a few could be considered more middle class. Some of those not actually belonging to the lower class, because of certain personal traits and attitudes are excluded from associations with other groups of Lesbians who might belong to a different class as is evidenced in the remark:

> "Sue is what you might call a Lesbian whore and has gone with damn near every stud in St. Louis. . . The school teacher set cut her loose. She used to run with them, but she would always bring undesirables along with her when she went to their homes, and they didn't go for this type of behavior."

It appears that a stratification system aside from the general one operates within the Lesbian community. Though no systematic interviewing has been conducted on class perception, we can ascertain that members of Jim's group differentiate between themselves and certain other types of Lesbians. If a status hierarchy were to be constructed based on some of these remarks, members of Jim's group would fall at the fourth level (characteristics and patterns of behavior of the group will be discussed thoughout the paper). At the very bottom of the hierarchy would be those "loud and dirty ones who are boisterous and make trouble . . . a lot of them are down on Franklin Street." At the third level are the less public, somewhat more ambitious persons who usually live together as homosexual mates, having established and maintained a relationship through time, and who "keep to themselves." At the second level are those people whose manner of dress and general pattern of living are considerably above those of persons in Jim's group, and who "have money." Among these are persons who are in some type of business,

usually proprietors of bars, restaurants, beauty parlors, etc.:

> "Now Gwen and Joan. . .they have been around for a good while and they don't hang around with these other people. They're intelligent and nice. Gwen has three homes. She'll invite you to her home, but you're not to go there unannounced, and I don't blame her. She doesn't want people coming to her house who won't appreciate it, and don't know how to act in it. I would call Gwen and Joan pretty middle class people. They like to do the same things I like to do."

In response to the researcher's question as to why she does not associate with people who are more like her, the respondent stated:

> "Well for one thing, if I felt that I wanted to run around with Gwen and Joan, I'd have to look really nice because that's the way they look and carry themselves. But me, I never did like to put on a dress. I wear my dress to work, but I'll come right back home and change into these old pants (slacks) and I'm comfortable. . .Gwen and Joan want the people whom they run around with to look nice also. You know how it is, if you have on a forty dollar jersey, you don't want anybody around with a t-shirt on."

The persons who, according to members of Jim's group, would occupy the first level are those persons who are simply referred to as "teachers, doctors and professional people." These are persons who appear to be much more secretive in their homosexual activities in that "no people outside of the life and very few in the life know they are gay."[16]

From the above discussion it appears that a system of ranking people who are homosexuals exists in Jim's group. Important variables for placing persons beneath themselves are personal traits possessed by those other people. The single most important criterion for placing persons directly above them is that of the ability to get along with one's mate, having maintained a relationship through time. (To get along well

---

[16]To be in "the life" or to be "gay" are terms used synonymously for being homosexual.

together is not to associate with members of Jim's group.) Besides this, either or both partners must be working and must be trying to "get somewhere" or "have something" together. The persons in the second class, besides possessing the qualities of those of the third, must also have money and be intelligent. Members of Jim's group tend to interact upwardly with the persons at the second and third levels rather than with persons at the two extremes. References to these extreme groups represent a "I know they are there, but I don't know who they are" response.

Members of Jim's group are generally separated into the two categories of studs and fish.[17] Studs dress similarly to males (slacks zip up the front, short hair cuts, no lipstick or make-up, men's shirts or women's boyish looking blouses, etc.) and attempt wherever possible to minimize their female characteristics, many wearing t-shirts underneath clothes to replace bras. Fish on the other hand dress as women in every respect, and to a casual observer might not appear to be in the life. However, aside from this obvious physical distinction (which serves at once to designate who is and who is not available as a possible mate), there are the matters of appropriate mannerisms and behavior, domestic responsibilities, attitudes towards homosexuality, the larger society and towards oneself which accompany each of the two roles. These two roles are complementary, i.e., a stud

---

[17] Studs are those female homosexuals who assume, both socially and sexually within this homosexual subculture, the role modeled after the masculine role in the larger society. Fish are those who take on the feminine role.

and a fish make up a homosexual couple. These two sets of persons, their corresponding values, beliefs, roles and expectations comprise the homosexual subculture under study.

The method of investigation includes a combination of participant observation, focused and structured interviews and the use of informants and discussion groups. The beginning stages of research which covered a period of approximately four and a half months consisted exclusively of participant observation during which time no attempt was made to interview any of the members of the group. Though this period of observation yielded some of our richest data, it also served to get acquainted and establish rapport with the homosexual subjects. As research has proceeded, observations on members of the group have encompassed a variety of settings including those where drugs are sold, distributed and used, parties, impersonators' balls, funerals, and occasional meetings at the investigator's home. In addition roughly one year has been spent in the process of focused interviewing.

This paper, which will by no means be exhaustive of the areas under consideration in the larger study, will concentrate on some problems which the data have highlighted to this point -- problems which have been of particular interest to the researcher and as a result have been given considerable thought since the research began.

Perhaps owing to the lack of sufficient sociological studies on homosexuality, it has come to be viewed almost entirely in sexual terms. Granted that the defining characteristics of homosexuals are in terms of sex, homosexuality is also a social phenomenon. Gratifications are more

than just sexual, and sexual aspects may in many cases occupy a position of secondary importance. To be in the life means not just to engage in sexual practices with persons of the same sex. It designates a status vis à vis the larger society; a position within the homosexual subculture itself; a participation in its round of activities; and an involvement in a way of living which for those who remain must be gratifying.

For the particular female homosexuals under study there exists a definite subculture within which are found operating certain attitudes, beliefs, values and norms which are transmitted to other members of the subculture. To attempt to account for certain facets of behavior exhibited by homosexual persons participating in homosexual groups can be misleading and at most only partially complete when ignoring the homosexual subculture itself. The problems of homosexual roles and role changes, of degrees of commitment to homosexuality and of mate instability which occur among members of Jim's group are problems which can be better understood in examining these phenomena in the context of the subculture in which they exist.

Homosexual Roles and Changes in Role

Psychoanalytic literature for the most part assumes that patterns of female homosexuality are fixed from early childhood, although Ward and Kassebaum in their study of a prison community have somewhat questioned this assumption in pointing out the various social aspects which are involved in particular roles which persons come to assume.[18] Likewise,

---

[18] Ward, David and Kassebaum, G., Patterns of Homosexual Behavior Among Female Prison Inmates. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1965.

Hooker has pointed out that among some male homosexuals whom she studied over a period of time, there occurred definite changes in role, attitudes and mannerisms which she attributed not only to individual dynamics and motivations, but also to adaptations of these persons to particular subcultural expectations and to each other in dyadic relationships.[19]

Our findings suggest that patterns of female homosexuality, rather than being in all cases a fixed phenomenon, are subject to change. An examination of patterns of initiation into the life shows that many persons who were once fish are now studs. Persons within the group under study have, since the research began, likewise assumed different roles.

The way in which persons become involved in homosexuality generally constitutes a pattern of initiation by persons already in the life, though in a few deviant cases persons not previously engaging in homosexual activities initiated each other, these cases usually occurring between intimate friends. Usually it is a stud who is the aggressor and the initiator in cases where fish are concerned. Studs on the other hand appear to vary a great deal in their modes of initiation, some having been introduced to homosexuality by fish, others by other studs, and mutual initiation between persons not previously in the life.

Fish do not always reflect the ideal type. In cases where studs were initiated by fish, this occurred either at a very young age and/or by fish who were considerably older and had been in the life a number of years.

---

[19] Hooker, Evelyn, "An Empirical Study of Some Relations Between Sexual Patterns and Gender Identity in Male Homosexuals," in John Money (ed.), Sex Research New Developments. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1965, pp. 24-51.

For persons who initiated each other, this type of behavior also occurred at a very young age -- 14, 15, etc., and in all cases persons involved were intimate friends and appeared to have been influenced by relatives -- older sisters, cousins, etc., who were already homosexuals. It might be added here that the influence of relatives appears to operate strongly in this group. At least three different sets of sisters are members of Jim's group, and one constantly hears references made to cousins, mothers, nieces, etc., who are homosexual.

Though the above variables of age and relative influence might account to some extent for the differential initiation of studs into the life, some of it may be explained by the fact that many studs do not like to admit that they were ever anything but stud. They have the tendency to play down all of their female characteristics to the point of insisting that they have been studs since entering the life. One significant difference between studs and fish is that where fish generally see themselves as victims of curiosity, studs almost invariably attribute their homosexuality to their own personal characteristics and attributes. Their patterned responses are similar to "I've always felt this way from a very early age." Another difference between fish and studs is that fish tend to minimize or under report the actual number of studs with whom they have been involved; whereas studs are less likely to under report. This practice on the part of fish appears to be to an extent a function of the social stigma attached to the situation of a fish having had "too many" studs as is evidenced in the remark, "Sue is what you might call a Lesbian whore

and has gone with damn near every stud in St. Louis." The attitude of fish towards their own behavior is reflected in the statement made by a respondent while being interviewed on mate history. After having reported ten names of studs with whom she had been involved, the respondent sighed and replied, "that's enough."

Cases of studs who were initiated by studs can easily be explained. At the time of their initiation they were fish and, like most fish, were introduced to homosexuality by studs. According to statements made by some respondents, most studs were first fish, and fish are the first to divulge this information. Often one hears the statement, "she is going to be a stud before long." Too, the reaction of the group towards the research throws considerable light on the subject. Whenever the researcher is accused of already being homosexual or becoming one in the near future, it is assumed by both fish and studs that the object of her affection is a stud or will be one. This indicates a progression from fish to stud. One fish expressed the desire to turn stud but had certain reservations. Her reasons for wanting to turn stud were that she wanted "to be the aggressor, to pick and choose, and to do the protecting." On the other hand she felt that she could not live up to the idealized social role of a stud. "I don't feel that I would be able to support someone. I feel that a stud should be the provider and protector and right now, I'm not able."

Though there may be a number of reasons for first being fish and then turning stud, the statement of one stud who was previously a fish suggests that being a fish first is functional for learning the technique of being a stud. She stated that "I'd always had these yearnings (been attracted to other women), but didn't know what to do about them, so I started being

friendly with some studs because I felt they could teach me something. I had to get started as a fish first and then when I learned my way, I said, 'I'm ready to be a stud now'." There may be any number of factors weighing on the decision about a particular role, even the manner of dress itself. One fish when questioned as to whether or not she had ever considered turning stud explained, "I wouldn't want my children to see me in pants (slacks) all of the time."

Whether or not a person changes or remains within a particular role appears to be to a great extent a function of perceived rewards and gratifications accruing to these roles. To briefly mention a few, studs as a result of having attained the ultimate in homosexuality (as is perceived by members of the group) are therefore privileged with a higher status within the subculture than that which is accorded the fish, who on the other hand enjoy the situation of marginality. In first moving into the homosexual subculture, certain studs were designated to me as persons with whom I should be seen in order to establish myself within the subculture. Upon questioning the respondents about the fish with regard to this situation, I was informed that it was just the studs whom I was to be concerned about and that "the fish would just fall in line." Another typical response encountered upon informing persons of the nature of the work (that of doing research in the area of female homosexuality) was "Oh, you want to interview fish too." One incident which reflects the attitude of studs towards fish and their status in the homosexual subculture was the failure on the part of a stud during the beginning stages of the research to invite any fish to a party which was given by the researcher for persons in the life. She didn't know that the researcher "wanted to talk to fish

too." This status discrepancy between studs and fish in Jim's group is sufficiently strong that if I felt there might be some difficulty in interviewing a fish, I was able to work it through her stud.

One knotty issue here is that there is really an ambivalence as to the actual overall status of a fish. On the one hand she is "definitely homosexual" whenever a particular situation calls for some clarification (most women would like to be if they had the chance or were not afraid), but on the other hand it occurs that upon asking whether or not a person is homosexual and if so, which role does she assume, the reply is sometimes, "she's woman, all woman!" Perhaps this situation reflects the marginality of the fish in the homosexual subculture. Their associations more frequently involve persons who are not homosexuals; their heterosexual relations are much more extensive; and in general, they are less committed to the life socially, sexually and psychologically.

Though the homosexual subculture of Jim's group allows for the assuming of different roles, it does not allow for the incomplete assimilation of these roles. If one dresses as a stud or fish, she is expected to assume the social and sexual role of the same and vice versa, as negative sanctions may be and are applied by others to facilitate conformity. In an instance where a respondent was asked to supply a list of names of persons in the life and to indicate their role by the position of the names on the list, she replied:

> "I put Joyce under the studs because that's what she says she is, but she's called me up a number of times and named five or six studs (whom) she claims she likes or whom she's supposed to be going with, but nevertheless she says she's stud."

"I stuck Hilda in the middle because I really don't know what she is. She's the type of person who says, 'whatever you are not, I'll be'."

Negative sanctions may range from mild remarks as the ones above to being referred to as a pancaker,[20] to open ridicule.

That homosexual roles are subject to change -- to shaping and reshaping -- appears to be substantiated by the data on Jim's group and to be highlighted in the preceding discussion. Though individual dynamics to be sure come into play, it is within the culture of the group that the possibility of assuming one or the other role lies, and it is the culture of the group which differentiates and attaches expectations to behavior and exerts pressure for conformance to one or the other role.

Homosexuality and "Life" Commitment

One of the areas in which there appears to be a great degree of leniency operating in this homosexual subculture is that of commitment to homosexuality. To be committed to the life is not a prerequisite for belonging to Jim's group -- at least not for fish. As was previously mentioned fish are less committed to the life than are studs. This hypothesis is derived from data collected in the course of participant observations in three general areas: the attitudes of members of Jim's group towards "the life" in general; their attitudes towards heterosexual behavior; and their attitudes towards being exposed as homosexual to non-homosexual persons. In a smaller separate study this hypothesis was

---

[20] The term pancaker refers to a person who is not entirely assimilated into one particular role. The term also has a sexual connotation that one can be "flipped" over and will assume any sexual position.

tested using the technique of numerical estimation, a technique which provided us with a method of determining norms and values existing within this particular homosexual subculture, insofar as norms and values can be determined by measuring feelings rather than actual behavior.

Methodology:

The subjects were seven studs and seven fish (half of the sample of the larger study) who were administered a questionnaire (2 and 3 of Appendix). The questionnaire consisted of a line-dot estimation test and two separate pages of the same items for likes and dislikes. The subject was first trained in the skill of magnitude estimation by instructing her to estimate the distance of various dots from a line. After having been assured that the subject understood the distance test, instructions were read aloud by the interviewer for the likes portion of the interview while the respondent followed along from her copy. Instructions were repeated until the respondent verbalized that she understood what was to be done. She was then asked to read along (silently) while the interviewer read aloud the items and to score each item as it was read off. The same procedure was followed for the dislikes section of the interview.

The questionnaire consisted mainly of items which I shall refer to as "sex items" and "life items," though several other items which will not be discussed in this paper were included to facilitate the honesty of the estimations. Sex items are items which have either direct or indirect reference to the opposite sex (i.e., males) and are represented by items such as having a date with a man; getting married to a man; having children; and having sex with a man. Life items are items which have reference to

being homosexual and represented by items such as having a main (stud or fish) mate for two years or more; being in the life; going to gay places, etc. The results of the study are presented in Chart 1 of the Appendix.

The hypothesis was tested by examining and contrasting the median scores for the fish and those for the studs on these two categories of items. The scores on the likes range from 0.00 -- 70.00 and from 0.00 -- 50.00 on the dislikes.[21] A score of 70.00 for likes and 0.00 for dislikes represents an extreme like for the type of behavior to which the item refers, and a score of 50.00 for dislikes and 0.00 for likes measures an extreme dislike for the behavior in question. Items with scores on both likes and dislikes are items representing behavior about which the group is ambivalent, i.e., they like it and dislike it at the same time.

Fish and Bisexuality:

Caprio defines bisexuality in terms of the oscillation between heterosexual and homosexual activities and the gratification of sexual desires through both means.[22] The extent to which these persons really receive equal sexual satisfaction through heterosexual and homosexual

---

[21] In order to avoid confusion and to facilitate the reading of the data charts, it should be pointed out that certain errors on the researcher's part were made both in constructing the questionnaire and in handling the data. Two items were omitted from the dislikes portion of the interview, so that there are only 12 data points instead of 14 for all of the dislikes (see Chart 1). Secondly, the computer was only instructed on the standardization point, rather than the standardization base also, and since there were many zeroes, the likes section and the dislikes section required different standardization points and different bases (70.00 -- likes and 50.00 -- dislikes).

[22] Caprio, Frank, Female Homosexuality: A Modern Study of Lesbianism. New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1954.

activities, though it is not an issue here, is questionable, as motivations to participate in one or the other relationship may and do entail many non-sexual gratifications. Therefore, for present purposes, bisexuality will be defined as simply oscillation between heterosexual and homosexual mates, regardless as to what types of gratifications are fulfilled and will be viewed as a manifestation of non-commitment to the life on the part of persons exhibiting this behavior as is expressed in their attitudes and feelings about the behavior in question.

An analysis of the data shows that fish, more so than studs, value heterosexual relationships and are thus more likely to engage in this type of behavior. The scores on the sex items are as follows:

	Fish		Studs	
	Like	Dislike	Like	Dislike
1) To have a date with a man	70.00	---	0.00	---
2) To get married to a man	66.00	0.00	0.00	50.00
3) To have children	42.00	0.00	0.00	55.56
4) To have sex with a man	21.00	30.00	0.00	50.00

While item number one was omitted from the dislikes section of the questionnaire and we cannot make a positive statement about the dislikes for either group, we can, however, on the basis of other items with corresponding scores on the likes (see Chart 1) suggest that the score of 70.00 for likes would be followed by a score of 0.00 for dislikes and a score of 0.00 for likes would be followed by a score of 50.00 for dislikes. In other words, to have a date with a man is highly valued by the fish and equally disliked by the studs.

While to get married to a man is not quite as highly valued by the fish as to have a date with a man, it is at the same time not disliked; whereas it is extremely disliked by the studs. The same holds for having children. The extreme dislike of studs for having children as opposed to having sex with a man may be a reflection of their feelings about getting caught. As some members of the group summarize the situation, "there is nothing more hypocritical than a pregnant stud."

The fourth item, to have sex with a man, while it is a clearcut case of dislike for the studs, it is one of ambivalence for fish. They both like and dislike it. While it may follow naturally from having a date with a man and getting married to a man (both of which they value), and is also a necessary condition for having children (which they also like), their conception of themselves as being homosexual perhaps influences their attitude about having sex with males to the extent that they place negative values on engaging in sexual practices with persons of the opposite sex.

It has been suggested that bisexuality is a manifestation of non-commitment to the homosexual life. An analysis of the data shows that fish, more so than studs, tend to place value on those types of behavior which infer more than just platonic relationships with persons of the opposite sex and are therefore less committed to homosexuality in their attitudes toward heterosexual behavior.

Without the aid of systematic interviews, through observation and general conversation, the fact that fish tend to be more bisexual than studs can be established. Some of the fish date men frequently and openly. Many of them who were initially dating studs are now dating men, some

having switched from stud to male and back two or three times since the research began. They also maintain, simultaneously, relationships with both males and studs. One fish who expressed a fear of being pregnant proceeded to take doses of quinine tablets in the presence of the researcher.

One aspect of behavior on the part of the stud which has been problematic throughout the research is the fact that though stud-fish relationships are constantly threatened by males, their attitudes appear to be somewhat more than lenient with regard to fish and their relationships with males. This might to some extent be attributed to the fact that many of the studs are unemployed and fish-male relationships are functional in the sense that males provide income to the fish and her family, lessening the demands that the stud seek employment or contribute to the support of the fish, and secondly that many studs, despite their masculine role, are instrumental in their relationships with fish. They are inclined to view them as persons from whom they may gain favors, mostly money. It is not uncommon that the fish is often the sole means of support in a relationship, whether through the aid of employment, A.D.C. or other means. Some studs have resigned themselves to the fact that fish generally continue heterosexual relationships, as is evidenced in the following statement:

> "I think that most fish tend to be bisexual. Many of them, when they break up with their studs, go back to the fellows. As for Janice, she was going with a fellow at the same time she was in the life. Also Sarah went and found a man after she and her stud broke up. I think it's kind of hard to keep a woman who is used to being with a man."

The preceding discussion is not to say that studs never engage in heterosexual relationships. In actuality they do. Some of them, despite their proclamations that they have always been interested in other women

and that they are the "real homosexuals," bear children after entering the life. The extent to which they actually engage in heterosexual relations, though probably much less frequent than fish, is difficult to ascertain. Whenever it occurs, it is a "hushed affair." However, the fact that they are much less open about their heterosexual activities also signifies a greater commitment to homosexual values.

Life Attitudes:

An examination of the Life items also tends to support the hypothesis that fish are less committed to the life than are studs. The scores on these items are presented below:

	Fish		Studs	
	Like	Dislike	Like	Dislike
1) Being in the life	42.00	---	70.00	---
2) Having squares know you're in the life	0.00	50.00	20.00	40.00
3) Going to gay places	14.00	5.56	35.00	0.00
4) Having sex with main mate	56.00	0.00	70.00	0.00
5) Having main mate for two years or more	70.00	0.00	70.00	0.00

Compared to having a date with a man and getting married to a man, being in the life is not too greatly valued on the part of the fish. Since the item was omitted from the dislikes section of the questionnaire, and registers a score of 42.00 for likes, we are not in a position to make a statement concerning the dislikes. For the studs, however, being in the life is highly valued as is represented by the score of 70.00, and we may suggest that the score of 70.00 for likes would be followed by a score of 0.00 for dislikes.

Having squares[23] know one is in the life is very much disliked by the fish and is a situation towards which the studs feel ambivalent. This ambivalence on the part of studs can perhaps be explained by the fact that there are basically three types of persons in the larger community from the point of view of the stud homosexuals. There are those whose effect through knowing could be negative, as employers, parents, friends, etc.; there are those whose knowledge would have no effect at all (the general public); and there are those who through knowing could be of positive value. For the fish, the square world is comprised of the first two; whereas for the stud, the outside world consists of all three. Those third persons whose possession of knowledge that persons are homosexual could be of positive value to the homosexual are the potential converts. As a rule, these converts are introduced into the life by studs, and assume the fish role upon entering the life (though the fish role may be only temporary for some). Therefore the ambivalence on the part of studs relative to having non-homosexuals know they are in the life may be explained by the fact that on the one hand, negative sanctions can be imposed in the form of loss of jobs, disturbance of relationships with parents, friends, etc. But on the other hand, it is only through revealing oneself as homosexual that one can go about the job of converting others to homosexuality.

Going to gay places is also valued by the studs more so than by the fish, who place little value on doing so, and are also ambivalent about

---

[23] Square is a term used by members of the group to refer to all non-homosexuals.

it. Their dislike for and the very low value attachment to frequenting gay places may be accounted for in viewing their other involvements with heterosexual activities and in considering their extreme dislike for non-homosexual persons knowing that they are in the life (a likely conclusion if one is known to frequent gay places).

To have sex with one's main mate is also valued less by fish than by studs, and for that matter is valued less than such heterosexual behavior as having a date with a man and getting married to a man.

One phenomenon which is difficult at this time to explain is that fish, like studs, value having a main homosexual mate for two years or more; i.e., in those homosexual relations which they do maintain or hope to establish, they place high value on mate stability. Perhaps this phenomenon is an extension of a fantasy operating in Jim's group, in the face of tremendous mate turnover, that "the next relationship will last."

Again without the systematic interviews, that fish tend to be less committed to the life where matters not directly bearing on sex are concerned can be substantiated through general observations and conversations with persons in the group. Whenever the occasion requires, fish will sometimes pretend not to be acquainted with some of the persons in the group whose dress and mannerisms render them obvious. On the part of the studs, their very manner of dress suggests that they have, to an extent, learned to cope with some of the conflicts which homosexuality might present to them. Though they are quite aware that homosexuality is being imputed to their dress and behavior, the fact that they generally do not alter it suggests that they are not so concerned with their public image. In many instances they make a point of denouncing themselves by

making passes at females in public, loudly proclaiming their homosexuality, and wearing men's suits, ties, and tuxedos on special occasions.

Secondly, as regards the research itself, fish appear to be much more concerned about their identity being protected than do studs, who on many occasions have revealed themselves to non-homosexuals with whom they were not acquainted as being subjects of this research.

The fact that fish also tend to associate with persons who are not in the life more so than do studs suggests that they are less committed to homosexuality and also helps to account to an extent for their non-commitment. The homosexual community for the fish is not a self-contained one. They are not as fully involved in the life as are studs, associating with males and at the same time are generally employed. Therefore they retain some contact with outside persons with whom they frequently interact. The fact that studs are to this extent isolated from the larger community reinforces their attachment to the stud role. Secondly, if there is a graduation from fish to stud as has been suggested, by the time fish become studs they are more established in the life and thus their interactions with persons outside of the life decrease with time.

Homosexuality and Mate Instability

One area of homosexuality which can also be better explained by taking into consideration the structure and the interaction processes of Jim's group is that of mate instability which operates to a great degree within that homosexual subculture. In all cases except one persons do not have the same mate as they initially had during the beginning stages of research, and in most cases there have been at least two additional mates since first contact with persons.

Mate instability has been documented in much of the homosexual literature, both psychoanalytical and sociological, as well as the purely literary forms (Caprio,[24] Ward and Kassebaum,[25] Rechy[26]). Due to the lack of sufficient sociological studies of homosexuals and homosexual societies, it would be difficult to determine to what extent mate instability is characteristic of homosexuals. However, there is some scant evidence to the contrary -- evidence which seems to point out that mate instability does not operate to the same degree in all groups. Many persons have been pointed out by members of Jim's group as persons who have sustained homosexual relationships for periods ranging from two or three to eight years. It is, of course, within the realm of possibility that these persons may be exceptions or deviants as far as homosexuality and stability goes. The point is that members of Jim's group speak of these persons with pride. It was noted previously that the single most important criterion for ranking persons directly above them is that of the ability to get along with one's mate, having maintained a homosexual relationship through time.

The data, to a great extent, tend to support the idea that persons in Jim's group have incorporated the value of mate stability. To establish a relationship which will continue through time, though persons may not

---

[24]Caprio, Frank, Female Homosexuality: A Modern Study of Lesbianism. New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1954.

[25]Ward, David and Kassebaum, G., Op. Cit.

[26]Rechy, John, Op. Cit.

necessarily live together, is a value commonly expressed in remarks made by members of the group. Even in cases where studs are engaging in one night stands[27] they usually have one person who is considered their main girl.

Given this fact that persons in Jim's group place high value on mate stability and are aware that it is attainable, the problem then becomes that of explaining how in fact the behavior (constant mate turnover) does not "jibe" with the values. Instead of being concerned with deviant behavior in the modal sense (mate instability is clearly and definitely the normal behavior in statistical terms), we are here concerned with behavior as it represents a deviance from values held and expressed by members of the group. It is suggested that mate instability is a consequence of certain sociostructural features of the homosexual culture to which members of Jim's group belong. Using this frame of reference, the concern will be with pointing out those features which lead to instability; with ways in which members adapt to or cope with the prevailing instability; and how these adaptations function to keep the system going (system here meaning the homosexual subculture).

Members of Jim's group have been previously characterized as being for the most part public homosexuals. In pointing out the factors which lead to mate instability, it is suggested that the very character of public homosexuality and the elements which define it are among the factors which produce a strain towards mate instability.

---

[27] One night stands refer to a series of non-meaningful relationships engaged in for the sole purpose of sexual gratification.

Members of this subculture interact with each other frequently in bars, at parties, at each other's homes, in night clubs and other public places. This frequency of interaction, though it may be seen as a major factor underpinning the dependent nature of members of the group on each other and insuring to some extent the cohesiveness of the group, also operates to insure some degree of strain with regard to mate relationships. Leznoff and Westley in their study of overt groups of male homosexuals point out that one of the elements which keep strains at a minimum is the absence of sexual advances towards each other. Members of the group seek their partners outside of the circle of friendship.[28]

Though in Jim's group there seems to be a certain degree of restraint among very close friends from advances towards each other's partners, apparently there is no real general code operating to prohibit these advances among members of the group as a whole, and very often it happens that persons are waiting for the "right moment" to pounce upon each other's mates. As a result there occur fights between mates as is documented in the case below.

> ". . . I was at Jim's sitting down in the booth with some more people and she (mate) came by and spoke to everybody that was in the booth but she didn't speak to me. But that was all right with me; but then Cecil asked me for my phone number and I gave it to her, and when Janet saw me giving Cecil my phone number, she came over and jerked me up and started beating me all over the place and outside."
>
> ". . . Me and Janet had one of our biggest fights. It was on Friday. We argued and fought before she left. This girl, Emily, had been calling the house every day and Janet found out about it. She would call and talk to me and Janet knew that I wasn't

---

[28] Leznoff and Westley, Op. Cit., p. 162.

what you might call a studbroad, but Emily was trying to be (Emily is a fish, who throughout the research has exhibited strong tendencies toward turning stud) and she told me that -- asked me why Emily was calling so I told her that she just called to talk to me. So she said, "I heard that you were going with Emily . . . why, last week, you let Emily kiss you . . . I don't want you talking to Emily any more."

This argument ended with Janet's leaving home, a suicidal attempt on the respondent's part, for which she was confined in a hospital for two days, and her subsequent return home to her mother.

". . . I saw a girl I liked whose name was Addie and Jessie found out about it. Me and Addie broke up. Jessie and I got into it frequently after I had started going with Addie. One night we got into a fight. She slapped me and I stabbed her."

These are but a few of the more dramatic cases but they serve to highlight what frequently happens between mates and among members of the same group. For the most part, it seems to be recognized among members of the group that this frequency of interaction among members affects mate relationships as is evidenced in remarks such as this one:

"If you really want to get along with somebody, if the two of you are real tight, the best thing is not to go around with the regular bunch. Just stay at home. That's the only way you can make it. You'll find that people who have been together for a long time just don't hang around with these other people. There's always some dissension in the group -- always some stud who thinks he's more stud than you are and the fish, many of them are whorish and flirtatious."

One interesting question which could be raised at this point (but not to be explored in this paper) is: Why do members of the group continue to interact and associate with each other in view of the facts outlined above? The answer might well lie in the psychodynamics of deviant groups -- the need to associate, to be legitimate in someone's eyes; thus the total gratifications received from group membership may outweigh the need for mate stability.

The fact that Jim's group is composed of persons of lower socio-economic status also has its effect on mate stability and seems to operate particularly in cases where persons are living together as homosexual mates. Sometimes where there are children present, fathers contribute to the support of the children and will often visit. Their very presence is a threat to the homosexual relationships.

> "Another thing that bugged me around there was that -- well -- her last baby is by a man who comes around sometimes. He used to come every Sunday. Well he gives her money to support the baby, so I would put up with this. He would come every Sunday and eat dinner. An then it just got so he wanted to come every day. So when he came I would just leave and go in another room and she would come back there and get angry because I wasn't being sociable. Well, hell, I know he came for the same thing I was there for so why should I be nice to him."

One of the main indicators of the public character of the group is the manner of dress on the part of the stud. Though within the homosexual community, at gay bars, gay parties, etc., fish seem able to cope with the dress of studs, and will often define an attractive stud in terms of how she looks in her regalia, they seem not so able to cope with the dress in terms of how the general public views it and what it means for them if they are seen with the studs. They frequently express embarrassment over being in public with studs and sometimes will pretend that they are not acquainted with them. This inability to cope with the dress, though perhaps just another indicator of the non-commitment of fish to the homosexual life, may operate in undermining mate stability. The dress of studs can be threatening to fish in terms of keeping their identity secret from the public, as in the case of one fish, who (whatever her other reasons were for wanting to leave the life) explained to her mate:

> "I want out. I'm fed up with going to Jim's. I'm fed up with the group. I want to do other things and go other places like

down in Gaslight -- places where you can't take me (dressed as you are)."

I have discussed briefly how certain aspects of the public character of Jim's group produce mate tension and strain, but there are also other non-public aspects of this homosexual culture which appear to disrupt mate stability.

Fish vs. Stud:

One other element operating to undermine mate stability among members of Jim's group is the fact that there are more fish than studs; a situation which could possibly be accounted for in examining the non-commitment of low attachment to the life on the part of the fish, enabling them to disappear and reappear on the scene almost at will. Also, a greater number of fish are introduced to the life in proportion to fish who turn studs, i.e., the process of becoming stud takes longer than the introduction of squares into the life. This situation (surplus of girls) operates to let the stud know that it is really not necessary for her to work very hard at sustaining a relationship since there are "lots of other fish in the sea."

There exists among studs in Jim's group the attitude that not only is a fish's place in the home, but that studs are in fact the ones who are free to go to bars, dances, and to engage in one night stands, etc. On many occasions they leave their fish home. In questioning studs as to why their fish were not with them, the replies were in essence the one expressed by this stud: "Now why should I bring her with all these gooses (fish) around? What could I do with her here? Nothing!" The fact is that many times, what start out to be one night stands end up in replacements.

There is a high value attached to making girls,[29] as is evidenced in such boastful expressions as "I was her first stud" and "I took her away from her old man" (husband or boyfriend). Though there are obviously other features of the system underlying the phenomenon of turning stud, this high value placed on new fish may sometimes be a decisive factor in determining whether or not a fish turns stud. Even old fish like new ones. In questioning one fish as to why she thought people turned stud, she explained:

> "A lot of people, after they stay in the life as a fish for a certain length of time turn stud. You know you have to get them young girls -- you have to get them young girls who are coming out fresh."

When fish turn stud, their previous relationships with studs are disturbed or severed. Given this surplus of fish, their availability and the high value placed on making new fish, some degree of mate instability is a necessary result.

Instability and Non-commitment:

The non-commitment of fish to homosexuality has been examined previously. However it will be discussed here in terms of the effect which it has on the instability of homosexual mate relationships. We will be concerned primarily with two aspects of their non-commitment: their general attitude that they can leave the life at will, and again, their bisexuality. Here we will examine some of the specific cases.

---

[29] To "make" or to "turn a girl out" refers to initiating her, sexually, into the homosexual life.

Let us take the case of Helen, who, at the present, has left the life. Helen is a single girl of nineteen. At the time of the first interview with Helen she had been in the life for about eight months and was now involved with her second stud. She and her sister had been nightclubing and met some studs. Her sister entered a homosexual relationship with one of the studs a few days later, and Helen soon followed. From the first interview Helen, though she stated that even in the beginning she had enjoyed being with the studs and had enjoyed their sexual advances, expressed some detachment from the life. She continued to date men openly and also stated that "sometimes I see them out when I'm with a fellow and they can take that for what they want, I don't care." Frequently she would ask whether the investigator was "ashamed to be seen with gay people." She then stated that "I was at first and still am to some extent." She further stated that were she ever confronted with the information which she had given the researcher that "I would swear (that) I didn't know anything about it."

In the next interview with Helen, four months later, she had left the life. She stated that she had liked Gloria (mate) and that she had welcomed the attention and affection which Gloria had bestowed on her. There had been few arguments between the two and their relationship had been one which aroused envy from other people in the life because they "got along so well." On her last meeting with Gloria there had been no conflicts and no arguments and Gloria was "content" as she had no expectations that Helen was about to sever the relationship. When questioned as to why she left the life, Helen could only reply:

> "I would like to say definitely (that) the reason I got out was because -- like I say the reason I got in (was) because of curiosity. Well my curiosity had been cured, so I didn't feel that there was any need for me to be in the life any more. I was ready to go back to the fellows."

Though there are perhaps many factors which account for Helen's leaving the life (with which we are not presently concerned), her non-commitment to the life is manifested in her attitude that she, beyond the point of satisfying her own curiosity, sees no binding obligations to her mate and to other persons and can at will sever the mate relationship and leave the life as well.

Though at the last encounter with Helen she was no longer in the life, whether or not her case is similar to the two discussed briefly below remains yet to be seen.

Georgia and Eunice are two fish who visit each other frequently, go out together and from all indications are good friends. Both live with their parents, have one illegitimate child (before entering the life) express some embarrassment about being seen with gay people in public, date men, and feel that they can leave the life and return at will. On several occasions (months apart) each of them has stated that they were no longer in the life. It has not failed yet that two or three weeks after each proclamation, they manage to show up at some social function on the arm of a stud whom they are dating or come alone and participate in other activities with members of the group.

Georgia is a fairly attractive girl whom many of the studs at one time or another have expressed an interest in. She may establish a relationship with one for a few weeks and then it is over. Her excuse is that she "just does not like them any more." Georgia's oscillation between

being in and out of the life is to the degree that it has become a standard joke between her and the researcher.

A Case of Bisexuality:

This is the case of Marie, a woman noted by members of the group as being notoriously bisexual and who readily admits it herself. She is twenty-six years old, the mother of three children and lives in one of the housing projects. She is separated from her husband, who is the father of the oldest child, but the other two children carry his name. Marie has alluded to loving a man whom she claims is "really no good." This man is stated to be the father of her last two children and is disliked passionately by at least three studs who are members of Jim's group. In all three cases, Marie's affairs with the man were seen by these studs as the determining factor in the severing of their homosexual relationships.

Stud No. 1:

> "Every time the man would decide he wanted to come and get Marie, she would always leave with him after having promised me that she didn't want to see the man again. I believe that Marie was in love with him but he didn't mean her any good. I told her this many times and on one occasion I told him. Each time Marie left with him she always came back knocking on my door and crying and telling me that she would not leave again, and I always took her back. . .I put up with it until I could take it no longer and I left."

Stud No. 2:

> "Every stud that Marie has gone with she has left the stud whenever he came around. Well you see, I didn't know this but anyway we were living together and I kind of suspected that she was still messing around with him. So one day Marie told me that she was going somewhere else and I just happened to walk into this bar and saw him and he spoke to me. And when he spoke, I told him to kiss my ass, motherfucker, and then I went on back a little farther and saw Marie sitting at the bar. She had gone there to meet him. So I got a beer bottle and went over to her. She didn't see me at first but then when she looked up at me her eyes got as

being in and out of the life is to the degree that it has become a standard joke between her and the researcher.

A Case of Bisexuality:

This is the case of Marie, a woman noted by members of the group as being notoriously bisexual and who readily admits it herself. She is twenty-six years old, the mother of three children and lives in one of the housing projects. She is separated from her husband, who is the father of the oldest child, but the other two children carry his name. Marie has alluded to loving a man whom she claims is "really no good." This man is stated to be the father of her last two children and is disliked passionately by at least three studs who are members of Jim's group. In all three cases, Marie's affairs with the man were seen by these studs as the determining factor in the severing of their homosexual relationships.

Stud No. 1:

> "Every time the man would decide he wanted to come and get Marie, she would always leave with him after having promised me that she didn't want to see the man again. I believe that Marie was in love with him but he didn't mean her any good. I told her this many times and on one occasion I told him. Each time Marie left with him she always came back knocking on my door and crying and telling me that she would not leave again, and I always took her back. . .I put up with it until I could take it no longer and I left."

Stud No. 2:

> "Every stud that Marie has gone with she has left the stud whenever he came around. Well you see, I didn't know this but anyway we were living together and I kind of suspected that she was still messing around with him. So one day Marie told me that she was going somewhere else and I just happened to walk into this bar and saw him and he spoke to me. And when he spoke, I told him to kiss my ass, motherfucker, and then I went on back a little farther and saw Marie sitting at the bar. She had gone there to meet him. So I got a beer bottle and went over to her. She didn't see me at first but then when she looked up at me her eyes got as

big as watermelons, and she was so scared. So I drew back the bottle. I was going to lay her out, but the bartender grabbed my arm. . ."

". . . I don't see what Marie sees in him anyway, but she used to do everybody like that and she still does. Poor Esther was nice to her. Esther was just a fool. She used to treat her any kind of way when she was living with Esther. He would come up and he would be there when Esther came home. He would have one foot all over her furniture. She didn't do anything . . . I know when I finally got fed up with the mess, I left.

Stud No. 3:

"See, she was messing around with this man -- this no-good man . . . He's no good, but she loves him. She's wild about him. He gets up and leaves any time he wants to and whenever he writes and says, 'I'm coming back,' she always lets him back. See I know she had been receiving letters from him. This was one reason why she was beginning to act strange. When I would say something about it, she would always say, 'Go get a job' (the stud was not working). I told her to wait until the first of the year and then I would get a job. But then I started thinking and remembering the things she used to tell me. She used to sit down and brag about how Esther and everybody had been taking care of her and how she talked to them and did them any kind of way. And I also knew about those times that people who had been taking care of her were left out in the cold when this man came back to town. And I started saying to myself, Esther and all those other people had jobs and would take care of her but still they were left out in the cold. She always took this man back so what's the use of my tring to get a job? I know I'll end up in the same place."

So far I have attempted to point out in Jim's group some of the features of the system which tend to undermine mate stability, such as those that are found in the public character of the group, the structure of the group with regard to the discrepancy between the number of fish and studs, and the general non-commitment of the fish to the homosexual way of life. Given no much instability, one question which might be raised at this point is: how do persons cope with it and manage to keep the system going?

The high degree of mate instability insures that fish as well as studs will be involved in the mate turnover -- that is, in changing mates regularly. Just as there is a value placed on new fish, there is a social stigma attached to a fish having had "too many" studs. There is no similar stigma attached to the practice of studs having been involved with a similar number of fish. One means of coping with this stigma or avoiding it is to turn stud and start out fresh. Turning stud is functional in keeping the system going in that it allows displaced fish to find mates among the new recruits.

Another means of adapting to or coping with mate instability operating in Jim's group appears to be that of fantasizing. With almost every new relationship it is, "this time we'll make it last" or "this time it's the real thing." A case in point concerns a recent conversation with a stud who came to the researcher to talk about the troubles that she was having with her fish. Her fish had threatened to leave her and the stud was very upset, stating that she didn't know what she would do if the girl left -- that she might either hurt herself or the fish. She wanted to know what she should do. She kept insisting that this time she had felt that she and her mate could make a go of it and told of all the plans they had for travel, building a house and doing other things together. The researcher explained to her that she didn't know what she could do about the situation but pointed out to her that if she remembered correctly, she had also felt the same way about her previous mate and had even attempted suicide. She could only say that "it really doesn't have to be this way."

The role of fantasy in the face of tremendous mate turnover operates to insure one at the beginning of each new relationship that there is in

fact reason not to drop out of the system -- to leave the life -- as this time it's sure to work out.

The role that socio-structural factors play in shaping behavior in various societies and groups of individuals has long been recognized. In attempting to explain certain facets of behavior occurring among homosexuals, just as among persons of other deviant groups, these factors must also be taken into consideration. In this paper, I have tried to show how certain attitudes, norms and values expressed in the homosexual subculture of Jim's group affect patterns of role and role changes, commitment to homosexuality and mate stability.

00 057

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1

CHART 1. MEDIAN VALUES

	Likes Standardization Base 70			Dislikes Standardization Base 50		
	Group	Studs	Fish	Group	Studs	Fish
One night stands	1.91	10.00	0.00	38.89	12.50	55.56
Main mate for two years or more	70.00	70.00	70.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Have sex with a man	0.70	0.00	21.00	41.67	70.00	30.00
Go to gay places	21.00	35.00	14.00	5.28	0.00	5.56
Have a steady job	70.00	70.00	70.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Fight with a mate	0.00	0.00	0.00	50.00	50.00	50.00
Have a date with a man	6.32	0.00	70.00	---	---	---
Support mate	0.04	46.00	0.00	49.50	0.00	55.56
Have children	16.75	0.00	42.00	0.50	55.56	0.00
Being in the life	70.00	70.00	42.00	---	---	---
Have mate turn tricks	0.00	7.00	0.00	50.00	50.00	50.00
Have sex with main mate	70.00	70.00	56.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Get married to a man	9.38	0.00	66.00	18.64	50.00	0.00
For squares to know you're in the life	3.50	20.00	0.00	43.47	40.00	50.00

0 057 3

APPENDIX 2

NUMERICAL ESTIMATION INTERVIEW -- FISH

Distance Test

I am going to show you how to measure distance by using numbers. Below is a set of dots which are various distances from a line. The first dot I point to, I want you to give it a number, any number you wish, to tell me how far you think it is from the line. Then as I point to other dots, if you think the dot is twice as far from the line as the first dot, give it a number twice as large; if you think the dot is 1/3 as far from the line, give it a number 1/3 as large, and so on. The farther away from the line the dot is, the larger the number you give it. If I point to a dot which is on the line, give it the number zero. It is not necessary to think in terms of inches. You may use any number you wish. Okay?

00 057

LIKES

Now I am going to teach you to use numbers to measure your feelings about certain things. Listed below are some statements which I will read to you. In the blank beside the statement, I want you to write down a number showing me how much you like (or would like) a particular thing. You may give the first statement any number you wish. As I read off the other statements, if you like this thing twice as much as the first, then give it a number twice as big as you gave the first one, or if you would like it $\frac{1}{4}$ as much, give it a number $\frac{1}{4}$ as big, and so on. The more you like (or would like) something, the bigger the number you give it. If you would not like a particular thing, then give it number zero. Any questions?

How much do you (or would you) like:

To listen to jazz _____

To have one night stands _____

To have a main stud for two years or more _____

To have sex with a man _____

To go to gay places _____

To have a steady job _____

To fight with your stud _____

To go to the movies _____

To have a date with a man _____

To take care of (or support) your stud _____

To have children _____

Being in the life _____

00 057

To have your stud turn tricks _____

To have sex with your main mate _____

To get married (to a man) _____

For squares to know you are in the life _____

DISLIKES

This time I want you to show me, by using numbers, how much you dislike (or would dislike) a certain thing. When I read off the first statement, write down a number, any number you wish, to show me how much you would dislike this thing. Then as I read off other statements, if you would dislike something twice as much as the first thing, give it a number twice as large, or if you would dislike it 1/5 as much, give it a number 1/5 as big, and so on. The more you would dislike something, the bigger the number you give it. If you would not dislike something, give it the number zero. Any questions?

How much do you (or would you) dislike:

To listen to jazz _____

To have a steady job _____

To have your stud turn tricks _____

To have a main stud for two years or more _____

To get married (to a man) _____

To have sex with your main stud _____

For squares to know you are in the life _____

To have children _____

To have one night stands _____

To go to gay places _____

00 057 3

To go to the movies _____

To fight with your stud _____

To take care of (or support) your stud _____

To have sex with a man _____

0 057 397

APPENDIX 3

NUMERICAL ESTIMATION INTERVIEW -- STUDS

Distance Test

I am going to show you how to measure distance by using numbers. Below is a set of dots which are various distances from a line. The first dot I point to, I want you to give it a number, any number you wish, to tell me how far you think it is from the line. Then as I point to other dots, if you think the dot is twice as far from the line as the first dot, give it a number twice as large; if you think the dot is 1/3 as far from the line, give it a number 1/3 as large, and so on. The farther away from the line the dot is, the larger the number you give it. If I point to a dot which is on the line, give it the number zero. It is not necessary to think in terms of inches. You may use any number you wish. Okay?

00 057 39

LIKES

Now I am going to teach you how to use numbers to measure your feelings about certain things. Listed below are some statements which I will read to you. In the blank beside the statement, I want you to write down a number showing me how much you like (or would like) this particular thing. You may give the first statement any number you wish. As I read off the other statements, if you like to do it twice as much as the first, then give it a number twice as large as you gave the first one, or if you would like to do it $\frac{1}{4}$ as much, give it a number $\frac{1}{4}$ as big, and so on. The more you like (or would like) something, the bigger the number you give it. If you would not like a particular thing, then give it a number zero. Any questions?

How much do you (or would you) like:

To listen to jazz _____

To have one night stands _____

To have a main fish for two years or more _____

To have sex with a man _____

To go to gay places _____

To have a steady job _____

To fight with your fish _____

To go to the movies _____

To have a date with a man _____

To take care of (support) your fish _____

To have children _____

Being in the life _____

To have your fish turn tricks

1200 057 397

To have sex with your main fish _____

To get married (to a man) _____

For squares to know you are in the life _____

DISLIKES

This time I want you to show me, by using numbers, how much you dislike (or would dislike) a certain thing. When I read off the first statement, write down a number, any number you wish, to show me how much you would dislike this thing. Then as I read off other statements, if you would dislike doing something twice as much as the first thing, give it a number twice as large, or if you would dislike it 1/5 as much, give it a number 1/5 as large, and so on. The more you would dislike something, the bigger the number you give it. If you would not dislike something, give it the number zero. Any questions?

How much do you (or would you) dislike:

To listen to jazz _____

To have a steady job _____

To have your fish turn tricks _____

To have a main fish for two years or more _____

To get married (to a man) _____

To have sex with your main fish _____

For squares to know you are in the life _____

To have children _____

To have one night stands _____

To go to gay places _____

To go to the movies _____

200 057 397

To fight with your fish _____

To take care of (or support) your fish _____

To have sex with a man _____